

REMARKS

A. Claims 1 and 6, and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over Whittlege in view of Spyglass Prism and in further view of Lewis because none of these references teaches or suggests acquiring data from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network using the capture templates wherein the capture templates control the acquisition and extraction process, as claimed.

All of the present rejections of claims 1 and 6, and their respective dependent claims, rely on the combined teachings of Whittlege, US Patent 6925595, and Lewis, US Patent 6513019. Contrary to the assertions in the Office Action, however, neither of these references teaches or suggests methods or systems in which data is acquired from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network under the control of capture templates, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6.

It is important to understand that the methods and systems recited in claims 1 and 6 include data acquisition separately from data extraction. Each process is under the control of the capture templates, but they are nevertheless different processes. The Office Action already acknowledges that, “Whittlege [] does not teach expressly acquiring the data from disparate source on multiple platforms in a network.” Office Action page 4. Therefore, it follows that Whittlege cannot teach data acquisition from disparate source on multiple platforms in a network under the control of capture templates. Indeed, even the Office Action can only point to a discussion of data extraction under the control of templates, but is silent as to data acquisition. The conversion of HTML to DOM is not under the control of a template, which is only used to extract links to be included in a second HTML document. See Whittlege at 26:22-29.

Adding the teachings of “Spyglass Prism: Concepts and Applications”, fails to cure Whittlege’s deficiencies. The Spyglass Prism reference describes translation of richly formatted web content, like tables, JPEGs, etc., into formats that match the relatively limited display capabilities on many mobile devices. Spyglass Prism, pp. 1-2. This reference does not, however, teach or suggest acquiring data from disparate content sources on multiple platforms on the network using the capture templates wherein the capture templates control the acquisition process. Hence, claims 1 and 6, and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over the combination of Whittlege and Spyglass Prism.

Adding the teachings of Lewis does not overcome the deficiencies of Whitledge and Spyglass Prism. Lewis describes an integrated data reporting system for real time data entry, assessment, and report generation. In this system, business rules are used to extract information from incoming messages. Lewis, 6:7-14, 16:38-63. This extraction of data from incoming messages is not synonymous with acquiring data under the control of capture templates. Instead, the data sources are inbound messages that are not acquired through the use of any templates whatsoever. Therefore, adding the teachings of Lewis to those of Whitledge and the Spyglass Prism reference does not yield the present invention and, for at least these reasons, claims 1 and 6, and their respective dependent claims, are patentable over the combination of these references.

B. The remaining dependent claims are patentable over Whitledge, Spyglass Prism and Lewis, even when considered in combination with Lonnroth and Arens,

Claims 3 and 8

Claims 3 and 8 were rejected as being unpatentable over Whitledge in view of Spyglass Prism and Lewis and further in view of Lonnroth, U.S. Patent No. 6,826,597. The patentability of these claims, which depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively, over Whitledge, Spyglass Prism and Lewis was addressed above. Lonnroth discusses a system and method for providing clients with services to retrieve data from data sources that do not necessarily support the protocol and format required by the clients. This scheme does not involve acquiring data from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network under the control of capture templates. Instead, intermediate response XML documents are created from received HTML content, those documents are filtered by selectively removing content according to filtering rules, and an XSL styling sheet is applied to format the response document according to another set of rules associated with the style sheet. Neither the response XML document nor the XSL styling sheet described by Lonnroth can be considered a capture template created to acquire content as recited in the present claims.

Thus, adding the teachings of Lonnroth to those of Whitledge, Spyglass Prism and Lewis would not alter the conclusions of patentability with respect to claims 1 and 6 set forth above.

Because these independent claims would remain patentable over the combination of references it follows that dependent claims 3 and 8 would likewise be patentable over these references.

Claims 5 and 10

Claims 5 and 10 were rejected as being unpatentable over Whitledge in view of Spyglass Prism and Lewis and further in view of Arens, "Intelligent Caching: Selecting, Representing, and Reusing Data in an Information Server", which discusses caching results of queries and how to use such cached results for future queries. The patentability of these claims, which depend from claims 1 and 6, respectively, over Whitledge, Spyglass Prism and Lewis was addressed above. For its part, Arens does not describe acquiring data from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network under the control of capture templates, and the Office Action does not contend otherwise. Hence, the patentability of independent claims 1 and 6, and by implication their respective dependent claims 5 and 10, is not affected by adding the teachings of Arens. Stated differently, these claims remain patentable for at least the reasons set forth above.

C. Contrary to the conclusions set forth in the Office Action, claims 59 and 60 are patentable, over Whitledge in view of Lewis.

Claim 59 recites, *inter alia*, the feature of harvesting content from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network by accessing content and media assets based on acquisition rules stored in a repository.

The Office Action has acknowledged that Whitledge does discuss harvesting content and media assets from disparate content sources on multiple platforms on the network based on acquisition rules stored in a repository. See, Office Action at page 4 and 9.

Adding the teachings of Lewis fails to cure Whitledge's deficiencies. As noted above, Lewis describes a scheme in which business rules stored in database are used to extract information from incoming messages. Lewis, 6:7-14. However, Lewis neither teaches nor suggests harvesting content from disparate content sources on multiple platforms in a network by accessing content and

media assets based on acquisition rules stored in a repository, as recited in independent claim 59. The system described in Lewis is based on extracting information from incoming messages, rather than harvesting data from disparate content sources in a network.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, claim 59 and its respective dependent claims, are patentable over the combination of Whitledge and Lewis.

For all of the foregoing reasons, all the present claims are patentable over the references cited in the Office Action. If there are any additional fees due in connection with this communication, please charge our deposit account no. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Dated: January 20, 2009

/Tarek N. Fahmi/
Tarek N. Fahmi
Reg. No. 41,402

P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
650-798-0320